DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 751 CG 017 919

AUTHOR Peifer, John E.; Cook, Lynda A.
TITLE Review of Educational Programs in Juvenile Institutions 1983-1984 and Implications for Special Education.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 77p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Correctional Education; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Institutionalized Persons; Needs Assessment; *Prevocational Education; Program Evaluation; *Rehabilitation Programs; Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

The introduction to this report outlines the Planned Educational Program (PEP) goals for institutionalized juveniles who are likely to return to public schools, and for those likely to enter the work force directly. The elements of the PEP process are described in the following section, and methods used to organize and conduct a PEP evaluation are enumerated. Limitations on drawing final conclusions from the report are offered. The next section contains institutional summaries for seven Pennsylvania PEP programs. Each summary includes administrative observations, needs assessment and student observations, curriculum and instructional observations, commendations, and recommendations. Conclusions and recommendations regarding the interviewing techniques used and the evaluation process are provided in the final section. An inservice training agenda for evaluators, and an interviewer evaluation packet, including a program evaluation model and interview forms, are appended. (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED252751

REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS 1983 - 1984

by

John E. Peifer
Correction Education Division
Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction
Pennsylvania Department of Education

and

Implications for Special Education
by

Lynda A. Cook
Technical Assistance Group for Right to Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education
P.L. 94-142 Funded Project
A Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit Administered and Supervised Project

CG 017919

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William D. Wades

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Institutional Summaries	
Cornwells Heights	9
Loysville	12
New Castle	15
Youth Forestry Camp #2	18
Youth Forestry Camp #3	21
Danville	24
Weaversville	27
Implications for Special Education	29
Conclusions and Recommendations	46
Appendices	50

Introduction

In order that the correctional education programs in the juvenile institutions operate with the flexibility needed to meet the highly specialized needs of the unique population, a "variance" in the Chapter Five Curriculum Regulations has to be considered. Annually, each institution is required to submit to the Division of Correction Education a Planned Educational Program, known as a PEP, for review to qualify for this exception. Item 1, found in the Appendix, is a descriptive document which specifies the complete rationale behind the purpose of the PEP.

The PEP application contains certain specific requests for information as well as guidelines directing the course of the educational programming. The educational goals of the juvenile institutions provide dual services. The goals are directed toward providing services to youngsters who will be returning to the public school system and/or providing services to the youngsters who will directly enter the work force. With these two sets of goals the division staff suggests the following:

A. For students likely to return to public schools

1. Upgrade educational readiness so that home-school remedial programs can work.

2. Provide successes in education to restore positive expectations.

3. Identify and build on the individual's successful learning aptitudes and styles.

4. Provide interim remediation in basic skills, to include scientific and technological competencies, to lessen the impact of returning to public school.

5. Identify specific characteristics necessary for successful re-entry and assimilation into either the public or private school sector.

6. Identify specific educational prescriptive components necessary for re-entry and continued longevity in public school.

7. Provide realistic assurance of the student's ability to influence their own educational productivity.

8. Prepare the student for realistic vocational choices by including career education orientation.

9. Instill a working command of the skills necessary to build a positive attitude and better understanding of the law enforcement system, its laws and legal processes to include the understanding of individual rights and responsibilities in a democratic society.

B. For students likely to return to public school:

1. Provide pre-vocational orientation to assist in making appropriate career choices.

2. Provide specialized vocational training when available.

3. Identify and remediate individual deficiencies likely to deter successful entry into work force or participation in additional future training education.

4. Upgrade skills and procedures necessary for securing entry level positions.

5. Upgrade skills necessary for maintaining employment once positions have been secured.

6. Instill a working command of skills necessary to deal with law enforcement and available due process, including understanding and working with rather than against the system.

7. Upgrade life skills necessary for independent living (i.e., health, work, consumer, community survival and law).

Needs Assessment is a critical activity in the PEP process since it determines the client's education program. Most clients are not in the institution for long periods of time; therefore, proper educational placement is critical. The average length of a juvenile's sentence is about six months.

The PEP process also requires an institution to describe in detail the basic education program. All courses, educational objectives, and methods for assessing student growth must be listed. A life skills program is also described. In addition, an institution must explain its secondary program, including the traditional subjects and data on the GED program.

Several institutions operate a prevocational and/or a vocational education program. The PEP document requires a description of all vocational courses, as well as data related to educational placement and career education.

The final section of the PEP document requires that specific planning data include staff development and in-service education projects which are to be implemented. This section often is given a superficial treatment, causing a major concern for the correction education staff.

During the 1979-80 program year, an independent evaluation of the institutions was conducted which resulted in the publication of a comprehensive final report. This report provided the schools and central office staff with much useful data. Data made available through this report is still used as a reference in administering the juvenile institutional system. Because the previous evaluation report was useful, the Correction Education Division's intent was to maintain the basic evaluation format while including changes which would result in additional information. It certainly was not the Division's aim to duplicate the evaluation report of 1979-80 by repeating the findings of

that report. A critical reader might wish to read both reports to analyze further programmatic data and to determine what changes have taken place in four years in each of the institutions.

The 1984-85 report is different in several respects:

1. Greater emphasis was placed on the pre-planning stage. Intensive orientation sessions were planned and held for the evaluators. Detailed forms were mailed to institutions prior to the on-site visits.

2. More emphasis was placed on collecting and analyzing data regarding special education students.

3. The evaluators were to have a greater responsibility in preparing the final report by completing institutional summary report forms.

4. Only seven institutions were evaluated, since those scheduled for closing would have been burdened needlessly by an evaluation taking place during close-out period.

5. The previous report was used as a pre-check to determine if earlier recommendations were carried out and new programs were implemented.

Diminishing enrollments and changing treatment philosophies often are mentioned as factors related to the closing of the two institutions not included in this review. State institutional enrollment continues to drop as a result of formulas for reimbursement established by both federal and state agencies for disadvantaged students. These formulas seem to favor the placement of youngsters in private and/or local institutions in that they tend to keep county level costs down while providing near 100 percent reimbursement.

The methods used to organize and conduct an evaluation of this magnitude required a total staff effort and incorporated the following steps:

1. When the decision was made to conduct the evaluation, the staff and "friends" of correction education were asked to recommend evaluators for the purpose.

2. While the evaluators were being identified and notified, the Correction Education staff planned two one-day workshops in order to provide the in-service information needed to conduct the evaluations. Copies of the two agendas for evaluator in-service can be found in the Appendix (Items 2 and 3).

3. A team leader was appointed for each evaluation team. This person was responsible for providing leadership and coordinating the visits.

4. The correction education staff developed an interviewer evaluator packet. Form A-1, The Program Evaluator Model and Form A-2, Program Evaluation Scope, provided direction for the overall process.

5. Form B-1, Needs Assessment Survey Form, Form C-1, Achievement and Ability Levels, and Form D-1, Staff Survey Form were to be completed by the institutional staff and returned to the Department in advance of the evaluation visit.

6. Form E-1, Interview Form for Administration Staff, Form E-2, Interview Form for Needs Assessment Staff, Form E-3, Interview Form for Institution Staff, Form E-4, Student Interview Form and Form E-5, Evaluator's Institutional Report Form were used by the on-site evaluators.

7. During the workshop, all evaluators in attendance were given assignments regarding specific institutional locations and dates. Team leaders were available to make any last minute adjustments. The final schedule of visits is in the Appendix (Item 4).

8. Following the evaluator's workshop, Division staff met with each of the team leaders to re-emphasize roles and to give more detailed directions.

The broad format for the evaluation required each team to (1) review the PEP and Forms B1, C1, and D1 prior to the evaluation visit; (2) collect data on all interviewing forms during the visit and (3) following the visit, submit to the team leader a consolidated and assimilated summary in a meaningful and relevant context (See Item 5 in Appendix). One day was scheduled for each team leader to meet with Division staff in Harrisburg to report on these findings. Since this process required a sequential approach before final conclusions could be made, it was not considered practical to schedule formal exit interviews with the institutions. Final report development required indepth analysis and reorganization of field data. Item 6 in the Appendix is the complete evaluation packet used in the evaluation process which includes all forms.

The process was implemented in a fairly smooth manner despite logistical problems. These problems, however, did place limitations on drawing final conclusions from the report. For example:

1. Unexpected evaluator absences and/or withdraws at late dates precluded finding substitutes. Consequently, some evaluation teams were short-staffed.

2. Forms B1, C1 and D1 were not always returned by the institution in time to be studied by the evaluator prior to the on-site visit.

3. In several instances, Form E5, which was to be completed by the team leader, was not completed with the detail or breadth of coverage that the correction education staff needed to prepare a comprehensive final report.

4. Attempts to have Division staff as neutral or "uninvolved" as possible was made more difficult as a result of the shortcomings in Item 1, 2 and 3.

5. Plans to provide "immediate feedback" to the institutions were delayed since much more time was required to complete the final report as a result of the problems described above.

Fortunately, the overall cooperation of the institution and the fine work of the evaluators far out-weighed some of the difficulties noted above. The data collected was insightful, useful and should prove to be beneficial for the decision-making at both the institutional and Department of Education levels.

INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARIES

Cornwells Heights YDC

Administrative Observations:

The program at Cornwells Heights is complex, difficult to manage and has had its share of controversy over the past few years. The 1979-80 evaluation indicated that the program was ably handled by qualified administrators. This evaluation visit emphasized that it is even better organized and administrated than before. The Principal is a well respected administrator and has been able to maintain student control, pay attention to the needs of his staff and, at the same time, generate a great deal of cooperation from the students. His open door policy seems to relieve the potential for sudden flare-ups and frustration on the part of students. His immediate supervisory support staff works as a team in assisting the principal who is understood and respected by the students. The faculty was observed as having high morale. No staff criticism was observed of the program, its operation, or its support services.

Needs Assessment and Student Observations:

The student needs assessment process appears to be adequate considering problems inherent in collecting primary information about a large and constantly changing population. Although most of the 13 teachers interviewed indicated receiving individual prescriptions for new students based on intake data, few described the process as involving teachers in prescription development. It was not clear that these prescriptions were developed using both intake data and information from previous school and psychological records. It seems that it is difficult to retrieve this data from the pupil's home schools. Singer-Graflex test information/vocational inventory was described as being kept in a file and made available to teachers upon request.

Classroom teacher assessment of individual student progress appears to relate to IPI (Individualized Prescribed Instruction) through the use of check lists for evaluating completion of learning packets. Although occasional references were made to limited group instruction in such areas as drama and team sports, most instruction seems to occur on an individualized basis.

Many of the nine students interviewed expressed that perhaps the school could offer a greater variety of options in the athletic areas. Others expressed interest in having more opportunity to work on reading/study skills and computer use. A few security unit students felt that they should have more time in classrooms, and that they did not receive an education comparable to other students in the institution. Almost all students, however, felt that their teachers did a good job, and that educational programs offered a abundance of good materials.

Curriculum and Instructional Observations:

Educators' classroom visits support teacher interview responses that appropriate supplies and instructional materials are available. A variety of computers, commercial programs, textbooks, and shop supplies, were observed.

While most teachers do have formal courses of study for program areas, the documents themselves do not specifically reference content on expected levels of achievement.

Although all teachers interviewed acknowledged having a supervisor, few if any were able to articulate a structure through which supervision occurs - indicating a very informal supervisory model. This model is probably very effective at this institution. Even though some evidence of formal classroom observations was found, the predominant supervisory mode appears to be teacher-administrator conferencing.

While such informal supervision may result in positive administrator/staff relationships, more direct program assistance may be needed to assure appropriate articulation and coordination of the written curriculum.

The staff development program seems to be limited largely to internal staff meetings which are organized and/or directed by administrators following teacher input. Attention to developing a long range staff development plan may result in broadened scope and quality of inservice programs. Contacts with agencies such as Bucks County Intermediate Unit may lead to partnerships in contracting for outstanding educational consultants.

Commendations:

1. Administration and staff morale is extremely high, resulting in an atmosphere conducive to quality education for students.

2. The appropriate certification and educational background of the staff is to be noted. Continued effort to encourage proper use of staff is to be commended.

3. A comprehensive screening and evaluation program was observed. This phase of the program is important in making the proper educational placement.

4. Teacher input was observed when planning for in-service educational staff development activities. Valuable input from teachers makes these suggestions more relevant.

Recommendations:

1. Teachers need to develop an awareness of the educational issues occurring in the public schools in order to improve teaching techniques and to develop a curriculum which encourages student re-entry to the public school.

2. Administrators in the education program should elaborate on specific problem areas that exist between institutional administration so that these issues are better understood and remedied by central office personnel. If problems exist surrounding after school supervision and homework, they should be dealt with directly.

3. Student files and records are not housed in a central location. Efforts to make files more accessible should be encouraged.

4. The institution and PDE should work together in developing more comprehensive, relevant in-service educational opportunities for education staff.

5. There is a need for additional emphasis to be placed on instructional monitoring and classroom observation. Instructional supervision of this type is found to be effective and should have beneficial results.

6. Although the evaluators found evidence of written courses of study there does seem to be a need for careful examination of the curriculum in relation to PDE Chapter Five planned course requirements.

Loysville YDC

Administrative Observations:

The Loysville YDC educational program shows many signs of being a well run system with high staff morale. The respect for both the Director of Education and Principal was evident throughout staff interviews. The fact that most of the faculty has long term tenure suggests that teachers and administrators have had the opportunity to develop productive professional relationships. The students' comments reflect respect for the operation of the school.

Needs Assessment and Student Observations:

The needs assessment process at Loysville is probably the most comprehensive and intensive of all the institutions. The school psychologist devotes most of his time to student evaluation and counseling. The reading specialist and the pre-vocational teachers are also involved in the evaluation program. Most students are involved in the evaluation process during the first three weeks of their placement.

The 15 student interview sample included an age range from 14 to 17 years and a placement/residency range from one week to nine months.

The students in general projected a positive attitude toward the school system and its staff. When comparing the school to their public educational program, Loysville was consistently given high marks. Much of this credit was attributed to caring teachers, small classes, firm and clear rules, mandatory attendance and subject matter designed to match their level of ability. A number of students appeared to have difficulty recalling the kinds of tests they had taken when they first arrived at the institution.

The most liked and disliked subjects reflected a surprisingly positive response to the more academic ones. Although most students expressed liking wood shop. Some students expressed dislike for English, Art, Math and Science.

Most students felt that the majority of teachers were good in that they support students and provide them with clear and fair directions for accomplishing realistic tasks.

The reading teacher clearly was identified as the individual most respected. Apparently, she gained that recognition by giving respect, explaining lessons, encouraging students, and generally trying her best to help. Compliments were also extended to the math and science teachers, despite the lack of interest in the subject matter. Identified in the negative sense were the art, gym and math teachers. Criticism was expressed over inconsistent assignments, refusing to offer help when needed, displaying a poor attitude, playing favorites, using foul language or physical contact.

Curriculum and Instructional Observations:

The educational program appears to consider the low achievement levels of the students. The program's well defined rules and regulations reflect the staffs' understanding of the students' needs for structure and consistency.

Although most staff appear to have little involvement in the initial student needs assessment process, the files are always open to teachers and especially problematic cases are discussed during regularly scheduled staff meetings.

Staff indicate that teaching materials and equipment are adequate and used in ways consistent with the educational goals of the school. No peer tutoring programs were noted. Well written course outlines and planned programs are available. Daily lesson plans were also in evidence.

Staff members are evaluated based on formal classroom observations by the Principal and Education Director. Teachers in general, however, feel that they receive very little structured feedback or assistance as a result of these visits.

Commendations:

1. The administration is to be commended for their skill in establishing a setting which allows students to experience success. The oft repeated motto "Firm, Fair and Friendly" is reflected by the staff and the program.

2. The faculty in general is appropriately qualified. Interview results suggest at least several outstanding teachers.

3. The student evaluation and needs assessment programs appear to be functioning successfully. Programs are developed to meet students' educational and life skills needs.

4. The principal is held in the highest regard by all staff. Invariably, unsolicited testimonial was offered as to his ability to establish rapport with and gain the respect of students. His visibility, availability and support were noted as being major contributors to the success of the program.

5. Daily wrap-up sessions are appreciated by staff and viewed as being helpful in programming for students.

6. Dedication of staff to both the program and the students is exceptional. Stability of the staff has encouraged program consistency and strength.

7. Without exception, teachers noted administrative efforts to provide for materials and supplies. In the contexts of budget limitations and a unique student population, supply and variety were considered acceptable by staff.

8. Staff in general feel the in-service program to be comprehensive and to have administrative support.

9. The Educational Therapeutic Group (ETG) program is well conceived. The planned educational programs are well written and appropriate to student needs.

10. The quality of teacher aides at Loysville YDC is outstanding and should be recognized.

11. Loysville YDC has exceptionally well written curriculum and planned courses.

Recommendations:

1. The approach to staff development appears to be broad and general. With a mature staff, it may be a worthwhile to consider a staff development program plan which incorporates topics such as: (a) The work of Madeline Hunter (UCLA) in relation to instructional skill development (b) Bernice McCarthy's emphasis on learning styles. Developing an on-going inter-institutional in-service program with other juvenile facility educational programs to share successes and problems may even increase staff effectiveness and morale.

2. Implementation of a planned perceptual-motor training program may increase the effectiveness of the IA, art and PE programs.

3. An emphasis on interdisciplinary program planning should be considered. For example, measurement skills needed in IA could be taught in math at time of need. Development of such an approach could be addressed in daily wrap-up meetings. A problem-solving approach to teaching math may provide students with life-long benefits.

4. The implementation of procedures to document events of the daily-wrap-up sessions may result in increased effectiveness of these and staff assignments in relation to those discussions could benefit students.

5. Existing software for the Control Data Computers may be too limited. To the extent possible, the software collection should be expanded to more appropriately meet student ability levels.

6. Involving instructional staff in providing feedback to needs assessment staff may assist in the effective identification of special problem cases.

New Castle YDC

Administrative Observations/Concerns:

The New Castle education program principal appears to work effectively with staff and provides strong program leadership. He appears to be approachable, and supported by both staff and students.

Staffing appears to be adequate in number, appropriately certified, and of good quality. The students expressed a basic respect for the staff, and perceived them to be caring and effective. The provision of additional subject areas in the ITU program may increase benefits for students.

Staff are involved in the determination of in-service programs. Most staff interviewed felt that visitations to other similar programs is most valuable. Teachers also expressed a need for in-service programs which would meet the needs of changing student populations.

Staff evaluations consist of an annual observation with an optional pre-conference and a standard post-conference. There is no evidence that staff development programs are based upon evaluation. The staff/student ratio ranges from 1:5 to 1:10 with an averagle of 1:8. Although some teachers perceive this range to be an unequal distribution, it appears to be dictated by subject area and student needs.

Another possible staffing concern includes the need for additional minority staff members. A model may need to be developed to provide for new teacher orientation. Communication of student treatment and educational goals between cottage and school staffs need to be improved. Because of the complexity of the educational program (academics, ITU, vocational program, ARE program and interfacing with the cottage program), additional administrative staff may be needed.

The PEP process appears to involve the staff, and the resulting document seems to accurately describe most of the program. A few discrepancies are noted however. In the area of State/Federal laws and regulations, concerns would be in the areas of special education identification and IEP development, the documentation of progress toward the stated goals, and Chapter I procedures. Instituttional policies which permit overcrowding, particularly of the ITU, tend to impact negatively on the educational program by limiting course offerings and instructional time. There is not room in the ITU facility to provide full day programs for all students. More coordination of the class schedules with institutional programs may increase the time available, but the overcrowded conditions remain.

Needs Assessment and Student Observations:

Master Case Planning Conferences (MCPC) and reviews are held weekly and involve representatives from both the clinical and educational programs. At the initial MCPC, the needs assessment data is used to develop specific goals and objectives of the student. Educational representatives attend monthly

staffings for each student to review and update his progress. Some teachers, however, see a need for improving clinical and educational staff communication of both treatment and educational goals.

The student needs assessment process involves a variety of methods. Two mentioned specifically in teacher interviews include the Peabody Individual Achievement Test to assess grade level achievement and the Vocational Interest Inventory.

The PEP document notes the use of the Woodcock Reading Master Test and Key Math for lower functioning students; however, there appears to be no systematic use of these two tests. We recommend that the procedure outlined in the PEP be implemented in order to assure that all teachers are aware of the student's achievement levels. According to Form CI (Achievement and Ability Levels) 50 percent of all students should be administered these tests because they are low functioning.

Although the Vocational Interest Inventory is administered, its results do not seem to be relevant to the actual vocational placement. Perhaps a more extensive procedure of measuring vocational ability and interest should be considered before placement.

Previous school records are not acquired or used in the needs assessment process. We suggest that a systematic procedure be developed whereby such records are automatically requested. This would greatly assist in a more accurate overall placement of students.

Interview results suggest that students feel the school can meet their needs best by providing more instruction in math and the vocational areas. Most students have a good feeling about the school and teachers, and consider instructional materials to be very good.

The primary purpose of the initial intake assessment is for placement of the students. The students' request for specific courses seems to be the major determinant in schedule assignments. During the first month of class, individual teacher assessments and observations determine the students' programs and instructional methods. Programs listed on MCPC's appear to be followed and based upon student needs.

Curriculum and Instructional Observations:

The staff is to be commended on their ability to individualize instruction. The staff seemed to be comfortable with this instructional model, and have adjusted their own style to meet students individual needs. Students appear to be aware of staff concern and commitment to student welfare.

There does not appear to be a systematic curriculum management and evaluation process which includes follow-up of students upon release from the program. The staff is responsible for the development of planned courses in the PDE required format. Although staff are also responsible for individual student instructional programming, they generally do not feel that they have input into frequently occurring major programmatic changes. Rather, they feel that they are involved only in planning to accomodate changes once new programs have been created.

Most of the materials and equipment in the vocational and academic areas appear to be adequate. However, there does not appear to be sufficient high interest/low vocabulary materials which would be most appropriate for these students.

Commendations:

Instructional staff consistently develop and implement individualized student instructional programs. A good variety of instructional techniques and materials are used to implement these programs. Most educational staff are well qualified and demonstrate interest in the welfare of students.

Good cooperation exists among staff and welfare personnel. This positive relationship can be used to develop even more comprehensive treatment and educational plans.

Recommendations:

1. Additional subject areas may be needed for student in ITU if appropriate educational programs are assured.

2. Acquisition of student records from public schools on a more timely basis is needed. Information from these records could be valuable in student program planning.

3. The staff development plan should be revised to include provisions for involving staff in curriculum development and evaluation processes.

Administrative Observations:

The administrative staff is organized well and appears to provide appropriate support for instructional staff and students alike. The education director seems to understand his role and demonstrates outstanding knowledge of the correction education field. The DPW camp director, the camp education director, and intermediate unit supervisor work well together. Morale among administrators and staff appears to be high despite apparent rumors about service cutbacks.

Needs Assessment and Student Observations:

The assessment of student needs is considered important by the camp in terms of proper program placement. The process appears to be comprehensive and covers a number of skill areas. Needs assessment data is summarized and developed into an educational contract between the student and the school. Both teachers and administrators are involved in the writing of the contract.

Most students indicate wanting help in the basic skills (reading and math); however, several have expressed specific needs such as GED, preparatory work to get into college, and credits for high school diplomas. Most feel that their educational needs are being met. Students feel that teachers are good because they are available for help, have patience, know the strengths and weaknesses of students, and spend time explaining the work. Students are satisfied with the quality of educational materials and equipment. Students appeared to be willing to share information. Their overall opinion of the program was very high.

Curriculum and Instructional Observations:

The teaching staff appears to be appropriately qualified for assigned instructional responsibilities. They appear to be involved to some degree in administrating the needs assessment process. A staff teaming process to identify student needs and commensurate progress was not clearly in evidence. A certain amount of sharing was observed, but it was mostly informal. Needs assessment data is available, but the problem of examining complete academic data (previous schooling) is still present. Student progress is determined by informal methods, weekly reports and standardized testing. The teaching materials and textbooks are relevant to the educational objectives of the students. Much of the instruction is individualized. Tutoring programs are seldom utilized. A written curriculum for each program area is not available. Individual lesson plans on a daily, and weekly basis are available because of the diagnostic/perscriptive techniques used.

The staff evaluation procedures seem to be well thought out and systematically organized. The I.U. supervisor observes and rates teachers at least twice a year, with informal observations taking place on a routine basis, usually by the education director at the camp. Morale at the camp is good, although it appears to be affected by changes in the types of students placed in the program.

The staff as a whole was not clear on how the total school program is evaluated. They seem to rely on output measures such as standardized test results.

Mixed feelings concerning staff development activities and in-service education programs were observed. Some programs, such as one concerning drug and pharmacology, were received favorably, while others were seen as irrelevant and inappropriate for the grade level and type of student. Computer related in-service programs were rated fairly high. Most teachers, however, feel that their inservice needs are being met.

Most commonly used instructional techniques seem to involve a combination of texts, discussion and individual help where needed. Very little, if any, instruction takes place when students are being confined or disciplined.

Commendations:

1. There seems to exist an extraordinarily positive relationship between the YFC #2 administrators and the I.U. administrators of the educational program. This factor has permitted a smooth and orderly administrative process to develop.

2. The educational program (overall) at the camp is to be commended for its specific, as well as its broad, effort to meet the needs of students.

   Both the comprehensive educational program plan and individual student instructional plans are well developed. Staff should be recognized for their efforts.

3. Student interviews indicate that students feel teachers are interested in student welfare.

4. Several in-service projects held during the past year were given "high grades" by the teachers.

5. Evaluations of teacher performance was carried out in a totally professional way and was given positive responses by teachers.

6. Educational material and equipment, as well as overall classroom space, seemed to be more than adequate.

Recommendations:

1. Even though some good staff development projects were evidenced, the school should consider developing a more comprehensive plan. Work could be included in programming for socially and emotionally disturbed as well as learning disabled students. Visitations to other education programs may be appropriate.

2. A written, planned curriculum is a necessity, not only because of the research which shows how educational programs improve through curriculum management, but because it jeopardizes status as an alternative program. Future staff development meetings could address this need.

3. Consideration should be given to strengthening special education programming in order to better meet students' educational needs.

4. Perhaps the camp would benefit from students' perceptions as to whether the programs are satisfying their needs. There did appear to be some discrepancy between staff and student perception of schooling.

Administrative Observations:

A close working relationship exists between the education director and instructional staff. The staff perceives the director as both approachable and supportive. Teacher evaluation and supervision occurs only informally because a formal process is not required by RCA, the agency responsible for educational programming. No written reports of observations are available. A more structured process of assessing teachers' strengths and needs based on evaluation is needed.

The administrative structure affords direct communication between the director and staff at both an informal level and at the weekly planning meeting. Four programs are identified in the PEP: GED preparation, remedial reading and math, vocational training, and co-op. Students are enrolled in a combination of programs based upon the needs assessment and parole officer recommendations. These four educational programs accommodate students from both "Project Self" and "B Dorm".

Needs Assessment and Student Observations:

A comprehensive needs assessment program appears to be in place. All students are involved in diagnostic needs assessment procedures within 30 days of entering the camp. This process includes a review of the students' court and school records, a WISC or WAIS IQ Test (if no recent IQ score is available), the Slosson Oral Reading Test and the Stanford Achievement Test. The IQ Test is given by the camp psychologist, while the achievement and reading tests are administered by the English teacher. Subject area teachers administer the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test, Survival Life Skills Test, Cambridge Pre-GED English Inventory and instructor developed tests.

The Singer Graflex Vocational Evaluation System is scheduled to be used with each student at entry; however, for the past few months, the counselor who operates the system has not been available.

A Master Case Planning Conference is held within four weeks of intake. Results from the Needs Assessment are presented, and an Individual Educational Plan with specific objectives is prepared. This plan provides the basic structure for the student's program and is followed by the teachers. There was no evidence that the student himself had direct input to career preparation decisions.

Few of the students return to regular schools, so the instructional program is focused on helping students obtain the GED. About 30 percent of the students achieve their GED diploma. The teachers are aware of this GED goal and operate their classes accordingly. About one fourth of the students are below the reading level required for successful GED instruction. For these students the remedial program is essential.

Curriculum and Instructional Observations:

The student needs assessment forms the basis of the Master Case Planning Conference in which educational and behavioral objectives are specified. The students instructional program follows these objectives. Program and curriculum development is based upon the needs assessment data. Because follow-up data of students after release reveals that most do not return to school, GED attainment is a documented student need. Most of the students are placed for less than six months, so the individualized approach to preparing for the GED becomes a short term, realistic, specific objective/goal to which most students can relate. The staff is aware of and supports this model.

There does not appear to be specific provisions for students who are unable to attend class. All students attend class unless they are ill or on a scheduled outing.

Tutorial instruction is used in the remedial program for low functioning students. This approach appears to be appropriate since most of these students would be very protective about revealing their level to their peers.

The staff seems adequate for the program needs. Class sizes range from 1:1 to 1:10 with an average of 1:6. Since the schools schedule is structured around the Camp Outward Bound program, there occassionally may be only 16 to 24 students in class while others are on the trail. When all students are in, however, classes are at a maximum size for individualized instruction. Students perceive the teachers as caring and interested in helping them learn. Most certification is appropriate except for the math/science teacher who lacks certification, and the vocational instructor has an emergency certificate while working on certification from Penn State.

No systematic procedure is followed for staff development. Suggested programs are discussed at weekly staff meetings and the availability of programs control decision making with some influence by the director's assessment of needs. While RCA supports personnel development programs, with tuition reimbursement, few staff members take advantage of advanced study.

The staff development activities appear to be related to general program needs rather than staff needs. Most of the staff were enthusiastic about the microcomputer inservice sessions. Visitations to other institutions with similar programs would provide the staff with relevant inservice.

The director and staff worked together to develop the planned courses. The planned courses follow the PDE format and are well done. Since they have just been completed they are not necessarily integrated fully into the instructional process. They can provide an automatic link between the needs assessment and MCPC objectives and subsequent instruction.

Stanford Achievement Tests are given every four months to monitor students progress. Release from the program is frequently tied to successful completion of the GED which provides student motivation for achieving a tangible goal.

The director is receptive to staff input into curriculum changes. The program appears to be making excellent progress in incorporating microcomputers into the curriculum.

Each student's program is individualized in an effort to assure appropriate programming. Student's progress is monitored at weekly staff meetings. Communication between education and institution staff seems to have improved a joint task force established to develop new communication procedures.

Commendations:

1. Education and treatment staff appear to be unified in working toward providing quality service to all students.

2. The total education program appears to have generally good coordination. The operation of several sub-programs, such as Outward Bound, could lead to confusion.

3. Program development based on needs assessment appears to operate smoothly because of total staff involvement. This kind of involvement is noteworthy and should be encouraged.

4. A reasonable number of students achieve the GED diploma. Considering the other program thrusts, the percentage of GED graduates is excellent.

5. A regular tutorial program is used and seems to have good results.

6. All programs and courses of study are well written and on file. Curriculum developed in the planned course format is well written and on file.

Recommendations:

1. Consideration should be given to establishing a separate education program for the group that stays at the camp 52 weeks and attends class every other week. Management techniques such as student contracting and tutoring, should be given consideration.
2. Some kind of education should be provided for those students being disciplined.

3. Staff development programs could be expanded to include programs that not only refine specific skills, but also provide opportunities for broadening and deepening understanding.

4. Greater emphasis should be placed on monitoring student progress and on developing a formal instructional supervision process.

5. Since RCA will no longer be the provider it is recommended that during the transition year, the special resources of the IU be examined and used where appropriate.

Danville (North Central Secure Treatment Unit)

Administrative Observations:

Administrative observations by the evaluation team indicate a solid, effective program. Responsibilities of the educational director are largely administrative, with support given to supervisory, programmatic, and disciplinary duties. There is a high level of team commitment to the program by Welfare and educational staff.

Needs Assessment and Student Observations:

The needs assessment process results in collection of student information useful in educational placement and instructional planning. Most of the testing is conducted during the first two weeks, with the exception of the vocational assessment, which normally takes place during the third week. Individual programs are designed for each student based on the overall results. The institution utilizes the services of the intermediate unit psychologist for tests of intelligence, perception and memory and personality. Student records are adequate; however, there is an obvious lack of educational data from previous educational and/or correctional placements.

Student attitudes concerning the school are exceptionally high. They are particularly appreciative of the small classes and the individual help they get from teachers. Students are experiencing a fair amount of success in reading and vocabulary but several expressed some difficulty in mathematics and social studies. The materials and equipment in the classroom was found to be adequate and appropriate to the students needs.

Students were quite articulate when it came to describing good and bad teachers. Good teachers are described as patient, willing to talk about pupil's personal problems, concerned, and understanding. Poor teachers were said to be boring, insensitive, not willing to take the time to explain things, [illegible] insincere about helping students achieve.

Curriculum and Instructional Observations:

Staff members are involved in the student needs assessment process in the reading and math areas. Educational plans are usually developed through a teaming process. Needs assessment data is accessible to teachers by requesting files on each student.

Student progress in instructional programs is assessed through informal methods. Results are maintained in student records.

Analysis of student needs and the job market is given considerable weight when planning the curriculum. The materials and methods used seem appropriate when examined with the program objective at the institution. There was no evidence that students who are specifically restrained or disciplined are given equivalent education; however, the school does attempt to provide materials and resources when physically possible. No organized tutoring programs (peer or otherwise) were observed.

Written course outlines are available for most of the programs offered, and appear to meet recommended standards for planned courses. Daily lesson plans are available for group instruction.

Teachers are evaluated formally on an annual basis by the high school principal in the Danville Area School District. Informal classroom observations are made by Danville's education director on a much more frequent basis. Teachers perceive the latter to be especially effective and useful.

Most teachers were unaware or confused as to how the overall program at the institution was evaluated.

Staff development and in-service education programs were deemed as extremely important in terms staff professional growth. Some in-service programs were considered more valuable than others. For example, the good ones were listed as: Passive Restraint, Computer Testing, CPR, CEA Conference and visits to other institutions. Least popular were those which dealt with traditional high school programs. Staff was hopeful that in-service education programs will continue to be offered by the institution.

Commendations:

1. Administration of the institution/school is excellent. Teachers, treatment staff, and administrators work very well together. Evidence of strong leadership and coordination of programs can be seen throughout the school.

2. Educational programs geared toward the GED completion appear to be highly sucessful.

3. The excellent relationship between the needs assessment process and the teaching process permits program coordination and articulation of goals.

4. The needs assessment process in general is very comprehensive and thorough.

5. The spirit and morale of the school was observed as being one of the highest in all of the institutions.

6. Students made it very clear to evaluators that the program satisfies their needs.

7. Regular staffing meetings are held each day to review pupil progress and to discuss ongoing program aspects.

Recommendations:

1. Consideration should be given to broadening the academic program beyond the perimeters of the scope of the GED program.

2. Even though most staff feel favorable toward most in-service education programs there still seems to be a need for a broader range of in-service activity. Programs relating to public high school could possibly be revised to establish more relevance to Danville's students.

3. Students seem to indicate a willingness to accept education beyond the regular school day. Experimentation with other school programs might be considered.

4. A study of all written curriculum guides or manuals should be undertaken to insure that there is a good match between what is supposed to be taught and what is actually found in the written documents.

5. Arrangements should be made for more frequent visits to other institutions to see how other educational programs operate under different conditions.

Weaversville ITU

Administrative Observations:

The educational administrator at Weaversville has a somewhat different role than at other institutions. He has both supervisory and instructional responsibilities. The administration of the program appears to remain stable despite the fact that total responsibility for the educational program is being transferred from a private contractor to the local intermediate unit. The teachers appears to feel very comfortable with the educational director; and, as a result, everyone is looking forward to working with the new administrative organization.

Needs Assessment and Student Observations/Concerns:

Records of students achievement prior to admission to the Weaversville institution are very scarce. Obviously, records on students identified as handicapped are not present either. Most other needs assessment data is well organized and accessible for staff use. Needs assessment data is not necessarily used for screening and is usually done during the first three weeks vocational education assessment is done during the third week. This procedure allows time for students and teachers to become acquainted. Students also have time to become familiar with the program. Staff who conduct needs assessment indicate their major role to be instructional.

Student attitudes toward the school are very positive and supportive of the educational programs. The GED, math and English programs seem to be student favorites. Most students, however, feel that changes are needed in the vocational areas. The classes apparently are meeting the perceived needs of the students through individual and small group instruction. They view their best teachers as having a good sense of humor, being respectful and having common sense. Most students do not see any advantages in a teacher who is not strict enough or who complains about their life outside the institution. Some students feel that they get too many films and that the classes are sometimes boring.

Curriculum and Instructional Observations:

The small staff size apparently necessitates total staff participation in the student needs assessment process. Staff teaming takes place on a regular basis, more often when it concerns the instructional program of certain troubled students. The needs assessment data is always available for teachers when it's needed. Student progress is determined by pre- and post-testing, "gut" level teacher assessment, and a review of the students' total education record. Teachers feel that there is a better than average use of material and equipment for instructional purposes. Tutoring is used to assist some of the slower students. Students having passed the GED do most of the tutoring. A written curriculum in all academic areas is available to any who wish to review the subject matter. Daily lesson plans were also noted for each teacher.

Staff members are evaluated by the educational director at least once a year. Periodic informal evaluations also take place. Staff morale is good and is attributed to opportunities to be a creative teacher. Give and take sessions between teachers and administrators are frequent and tend to improve teaching techniques.

Staff development and in-service education projects are considered important by staff and take place regularly. Some of the topics that were received most favorably were: drug and alcohol dependency, visits to other YDC's, teaching the exceptional student, and stress management. PDE sponsored programs and sex offender programs are not felt to be appropriate in-service activities.

Commendations:

1. An excellent relationship exists between the school staff and treatment staff. School is encouraged to continue with all such features of the program that contribute to this environment.

2. Needs assessment procedures were found to be superior. There is an excellent match between diagnostic findings and the instructional program.

3. A positive student attitude toward school was clearly noted and all factors related to good attitudes should be continued.

4. A well prepared written curriculum was observed. There also seems to be high congruence between what is written and what is taught.

5. School is further encouraged to participate in staff development programs that seemed to be successful in the past.

Recommendations:

1. Apparently there is a delicate balance between teaching staff, administration, treatment staff and the community. It is recommended that every effort be taken not to disrupt the harmony that is so essential to the success of the institution.

2. The potential might be here to increase the peer-tutoring program. Evaluators recommend that this be explored and determine if this activity could be expanded.

3. To improve on an already successful staff development program might require a more sensitive mechanism to determine needs. We are recommending that this be pursued. In particular, those staff development activities that are considered worthwhile by the staff, and can be traced to improving pupil achievement levels, should definitely be encouraged.

4. It is recommended that during this transition year the resources of the I.U. be fully explored to determine what specific help might be needed.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

Introduction:

The Spring, 1984 Correctional Education Program review model incorporated items designed to assess appropriateness of educational programming for students having educational handicaps. (Interviewer pack Form A1 in the Appendix.) The inclusion of these items indicates PDE's recognition of the need to assure appropriate programming for all students, including those with educational handicaps.

Establisning estimates of incidences of handicapped learners in correctional populations is difficult because of characteristics of both the population and the settings. Murray (1976) categorizes determination difficulties as definitional, diagnostic, procedural, analytical, presentational in relation to study summaries.[1] Another issue posing difficulty in identifyin; handicapped offender populations is that offenders are housed in a number of settings -- detention centers, diagnostic/classification centers, training schools, group homes, local jails and county, federal or state prisons. A further complication in studying juvenile offender populations is that relatively short-term placements of three to nine months result in rapid population turnover.

Recent studies indicate estimates of handicapped offender populations to range from zero to 100 percent. Although there does not seem to be a definite study concerning incidences of handicaps among incarcerated populations, results from a study conducted by Morgan (1979) are cited widely throughout the literature.[2] In a nationwide survey of 204 juvenile institutions, Morgan identified 42.1% of the population as handicapped according to nationally accepted legal definitions. Handicap categories identified in the study include learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, physical handicaps and visual or hearing impairments. Incidence estimates resulting from Morgan's study, compared to generally accepted incidence figures (Dunn, 1973), summarize this issue.[3]

	Morgan (1979) Offender Population	Dunn (1973) General Population
Emotionally Disturbed	16.1	2.0
Specific Learning Disabilities	10.6	1.5
Educable Mentally Retarded	7.7	1.5
Trainable Mentally Retarded	1.8	0.8
Speech Impaired	1.7	3.5
Visually Impaired	1.6	0.1
Hearing Impaired	1.4	0.6
Other	1.1	0.6
Totals	42.1%	10.3%

[1]Murray, CA. The Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency: Current Theory and Knowledge. Washington, DC, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

[2]Morgan, D. J. (1979) Prevalence and Types of Handicapping Conditions Found in Juvenile Correctional Institutions: A National Survey. Journal of Special Education, 13, 283-295.

[3]Dunn, L. M. (Ed.) Exceptional Children in the Schools. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1973.

Eggleston (1983), in a survey of 94 state directors of correctional education programs and correctional facilities or agencies, also found handicapped incidence estimates to range from zero to 100 percent, with a mean of 40 to 45 percent.[4] She indicated, however, that incidence estimates tend to be determined by administrative priorities. Of the 37 states which responded to the survey, only 17 indicated having state plans including correctional special education. Only 60 percent of the 37 states responded as having defined, operational special education programs. Only 29 percent appear to follow comprehensive diagnostic and identification programs.

Based on survey responses, Eggleston concluded the following in relation to correctional special education:

- Although a number of exemplary programs exist, the level of service nationwide generally is below levels mandated in federal legislation concerning the handicapped. Juvenile programs, however, tend to be more sophistocated than adult programs.

- Legal interpretation of federal handicapped legislation (P.L. 94-142) is needed in relation to correctional settings.

- Litigative decisions will determine levels of correctional special education services unless a coordinated effort can be made.

- A pro-active decision making stance will facilitate increased control over outcomes of possible litigation.

A number of recent studies have investigated possible links between handicaps and juvenile delinquency (Dunivant, 1982), Keilitz, Saks, Brodem, 1979), (Crawford, 1982), (Santamovr and West, 1977), (Smith, Wydra, Klotz, 1980).[5]

[4] Eggleston, C. (1983). Correctional Education Association Special Education Survey, Unpublished Manuscript.

[5] Dunivant, Noel. The Relationships Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency, National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, VA 1982.

Crawford, Dorothy. The ACLD Project: A Study in Investigating the Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency, National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and U.S. Department of Justice, 1982.

Keilitz, Ingo, Michael J. Saks and Paul K. Broden. The Evaluation of the Learning Disabilities/Juvenile Delinquency Remediation Program: Evaluation Design and Interim Results. National Center for State Courts, August 1979.

Santamour, M. and West, B. The Mentally Retarded Offender and Corrections, Washington, DC: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Justice Department, 1977.

Smith, H.L., Wydra D. and L. Klotz (1980 July). "Interagency Cooperation in Serving the Exceptional Children in Louisiana's Correctional Facilities." The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(3), 108-112.

Dunivant (1982), in reviewing an Association for Children with Learning Disabilities study, concludes that children and youth with learning disabilities handicaps are at relatively higher risk of becoming delinquent than their nonhandicapped peers. He suggests five hypotheses for this position:

- school failure
- susceptibility
- differential arrest
- differential adjudication
- differential disposition

Obviously, a number of systems and/or agencies are involved in the above hypotheses.

Santamour and West (1979) explain that the relationship between mental retardation and criminal behavior has long been a source of debate.[6] They suggest that the disproportionate numbers of retarded persons in correctional settings are a reflection of administrative and legal artifacts within the criminal justice system, rather than a direct causal relationship between mental retardation and criminality.

They explore programming concerns for mentally retarded offenders in reviewing three major program delivery models:

- segregation and use of special facilities
- normalization and mainstreaming within the general correctional population
- the use of alternatives to incarceration for mentally retarded offenders

Regardless of the variation in handicapped offender incidence estimates, the above studies provide sufficient evidence to warrant PDE/Correction Education Division attention to developing policy and planning procedures for correctional special education programming. Efforts to develop correctional special education policies and programs necessitate careful review and possible re-interpretation of legislation which has had major impact on national special education programming.

One of the most important pieces of legislation is The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, often referred to as P.L. 94-142. This act mandates the provision of a free, appropriate public education for all handicapped children and youth under the age of 22. Provisions of this mandate extend to handicapped youthful offenders in correctional education programs, regardless of whether or not the programs receive funding under the act. PDE, as the State Education Agency (SEA), is responsible through local education agencies for assuring implementation of P.L. 94-142. Local education agencies for the juvenile correctional education system include school districts, intermediate units and one private vendor. For the adult system, PDE is both the state and local education agency.

[6] Santamour, M. and B. West. Retardation and Criminal Justice: A Training Manual for Criminal Justice Personnel. President's Committee on Mental Retardation, Washington, DC, 1979.

Six major P.L. 94-142 provisions of most immediate importance in developing policies and programs include:

- Free, Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)
- Nondiscriminatory evaluation resulting in placement
- Individualized Education Program (IEP)
- Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) educational placement
- Procedural Safeguards/Due Process
- Parent/Student participation in decision making

PDE/Correction Education Division must examine each provision in relation to what currently is happening in the state's correctional education programs. Plans must be developed to assure appropriate compliance.

FAPE essentially means that handicapped students must be provided appropriate educational programs at public expense and under public supervision and direction. A handicapped student is identified as one who is school-aged (to 22 years of age), who differs from normal students, and who because of those differences requires special educational programming and services in order to learn to full capacity.

Students must receive a full and individual evaluation of educational needs before the need for special education placement can be determined. This evaluation must include all areas relating to a suspected disability - health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status and motor abilities. The evaluation must be multidisciplinary - no single procedure can be used to determine the need for special education. The evaluation must not be racially or culturally discriminatory. Review of evaluation data by a multidisciplinary team provides the basis for determining special education program eligibility and for developing the IEP.

An IEP must be developed prior to initial special education placement or change in special education assignment. Parent/guardians, surrogate parents and/or students must be provided an opportunity to participate in developing the IEP. Mandated components of the IEP include:

- Present levels of educational performance
- Dates for beginning and expected duration of special education programming
- Annual goals and short term objectives
- Objective criteria, evaluation procedures and schedules
- Statement and extent of participation in regular education
- Description or listing of all special education and related services

Related services include, but are not limited to, audiology, speech therapy, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation and counseling. Decisions on what if any related services a student needs are based on the two questions:

- What is it that will help a student to benefit from an educational program?

. Does the student need a particular service to benefit from a special education program?

LRE placement realizes a match between the learning needs of the student and the conditions of the educational environment, while encouraging appropriate integration with nonhandicapped peers.

Due process procedures, or procedural safeguards, are set forth in P.L. 94-142 as the cornerstone for protecting the rights of handicapped students. These safeguards provide students/parents the right to challenge any aspect of the student's special education program. Before any change in education services occurs, an education agency is required to provide, in writing, notification to parents. Following notification, specific parental consent must be given before an education agency can undertake initial student evaluation or placement. Parent-school disagreement may result in a hearing on any aspect of a special education dispute.

Another important aspect of P.L. 94-142 involves access to a handicapped student's records. Provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), also known as the Buckley Amendment, are included in P.L. 94-142. Included in the provisions of this act is the right for parents or students over 18 years of age to obtain access to educational records. Schools are required to establish written procedures to carry out these rights.

Another landmark piece of legislation is Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. This civil rights law covers discrimination in a wide range of national activities, from employment through transportation and education. Its basic purpose is to eliminate discrimination against the handicapped and to assist them in becoming integrated with the nonhandicapped. Both P.L. 94-142 and Section 504 require the provision of a free, appropriate public education.

In addition to considering P.L. 94-142 and Section 504 provisions in developing appropriate special education programs, juvenile system educational programs must consider the Pennsylvania Public School Code, Title 22 (Section 1926). This section indicates that education programs in institutions must comply with all Pennsylvania laws and regulations for public schools. The Pennsylvania Public School Code provides the legal basis for educational programs in the state. Title 22 provides the regulations which govern Pennsylvania education. Chapters in Title 22 of particular interest in this report are Chapter 5 (Curriculum Regulations) and Chapter 13 (Special Education Regulations). Those chapters are described in more detail in the Conclusions/Implications section of this paper.

REVIEW OF JUVENILE EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION DATA IN RELATION TO P.L. 94-142

Education programs in Pennsylvania's juvenile correctional system must be in compliance with the Pennsylvania School Code (Section 1926). Although no formal policies and procedures exist at this time for the provision of special education programs and services, all facilities do describe procedures designed to assure delivery of education programs appropriate to student's needs.

Currently, two juvenile education system programs do offer formalized special education services. The Southeast Secure Treatment Unit (SESTU), one of three secure centers, is designed to serve only mentally retarded offenders. Because the Correction Education Division funds only the summer educational program for this center, it was not included in this evaluation. Youth Forestry Camp #2, one of two camps in the state, operates two half-day special education resource room programs under the supervision of Intermediate Unit #21. Students in this program are engaged in a screening/diagnostic process, usually within 30 days of intake. This process includes a minimum of health, intelligence and academic achievement screening and/or indepth evaluation.

All juvenile correctional facilities engage in a DPW-required Master Case Planning Conference (MCPC) process, through which both welfare and education staff meet to review student intake data and to develop individual student treatment and education prescriptions. This MCPC process may be viewed as a multidisciplinary approach to planning for students, in that evaluation and intake information from a number of sources is reviewed by professional staff from several fields. Available court and previous educational placement records are also reviewed. A system-wide source of concern in this process, however, involves incomplete or unavailable previous school records.

Evaluation Form (B2) was used to review approximately 10% of student records at each facility. Results from this review are shown on Table 1. Only 23, or approximately 30%, of the 81 student files reviewed included records from previous educational placements (Column III). Five records, or 20 percent, of available previous educational placement records indicated that students had been identified as handicapped for educational purposes prior to intake in the juvenile corrections programs (Column V).

Table 1, Column II, indicates that most programs maintain some intake evaluation documentation. In almost every institution, two or more professionals review needs assessment data in developing student education programs. Most also maintain some form of student progress monitoring documentation (Column IV). Record reviewers, however, indicated that such progress reports often were not in student records or took the form of simple marking period grade reports.

RECORDS REVIEW - JUVENILE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

TABLE 1

I Institution	II Needs Assessment	III Previous Records Available	IV Progress Documentation	V Spec. Ed. Identification
YFC #2 N-10	*A 10 *B 9 *C 8	9	9	2
YFC #3 N-15	A 11 B 11 C 11	1	11	1
Loysville N-10	A 15 B 15 C 15	7	15	0
Weaversville N-10	A 10 B 10 C 10	1	10	0
Danville N-10	A 10 B 10 C 10	5	10	0
Cornwells Heights N-15	A 15 B 15 C 15	0	15	0
New Castle N-10	A 10 B 3 C 2	0	9	2

N-81 records reviewed

*A - Assessment methods and results documents

*B - Evidence of involvement of more than one professional in needs assessment review

*C - Evidence of needs assessment results being used in student program development

Form B1, sent to educational directors for completion and return before onsite evaluation visitations, was used to identify most widely used screening and diagnostic methods. Directors also indicated which staff administered assessments and why individual methods were selected.

According to responses, most assessment methods are selected by the staff who administer them. Selection seems to be based on convenience or ease of administration in relation to the quantity of useful information able to be obtained. One program explained selecting academic and vocational assessment instruments based on their ability to provide a sound basis for individualizing instruction. This same program selects intelligence, personality and perception/memory assessments using a team approach under the institution Manager of Rehabilitative Services. Several directors explained that assessments are selected from a PDE/DPW approved list of appropriate measures. One director stressed that achievement measurements were selected based on their ability to be used as a reliable pre-post test instrument. In all cases, assessments appear to be administered by appropriately qualified personnel, psychologists, guidance counselors, reading specialists and appropriately trained instructional staff.

MOST FREQUENTLY USED ASSESSMENT METHODS

TABLE 2

FORM B 1 CUMULATIVE RESULTS

	Academic Achievement	Intelligence	Vocational	Perception-Memory	Personality	Other
YFC #3	SAT	WISC-R,WAIS (if needed)	Singer			
Loysville	WRAT Key Math Woodcock Reading	WISC-R,WAIS	Picture Interest Inventory Singer	Bender Hooper Mann-Suiter Goldman-Fristoe	MMPI Rorschach TAT	Mooney
YFC #2	WRAT SAT Key Math Fry Oral Reading GED Predictor	WISC,WAIS	Observation	Detroit Gates Associative Learning Test	WAIS Rorschach	Armed Forces Test
Weaversville	PIAT Key Math Slossen Reading SAT	WISC,WAIS	Self-Directed Search OSAP Work Sample GATB	Bender GATB	Interview TAT Taylor Johnson Template Analysis Jessness Inventory	Tennessee Self Concept Scale Incomplete Sentences
Danville	WRAT SAT Informal Inventories Key Math	Slosson Intelligence WISC,WAIS	Vocational Interest & Skill Assessment Vocational Interview	Bender	TAT Sentence Completion Hand Test Drawings	Initial School Interview
Cornwells Heights	Key Math SAT Gates Maginitie Reading	*Indicate DPW function	Singer GATB Kuder-Preference Test	*Indicate DPW function	*Indicate DPW function	Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale
New Castle	Key Math Woodcock Reading	PIAT	Guilford-Zimmerman Main Interest Inventory			Educational Interview Form

Key to Abbreviations:

SAT - Stanford Achievement Test
WRAT - Wide Range Achievement Test
TABE - Test of Adult Basic Education
GED - General Education Development
PIAT - Peabody Individual Achievement Test
WISC-R - Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children/Revised
WAIS - Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale
SINGER - Singer Graflex
GATB - General Aptitude Test Battery
OSAP WORK SAMPLE - Occupational Skills Assessment Program
BENDER - Bender Gestalt
DETROIT - Detroit Test of Learning
TAT - Thematic Apperception Test
MMPI - Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
MOONEY - Mooney Problem Checklist

The Key Math, Wide Range Achievement Test and Stanford Achievement Tests appear to be the most-used measures for skill achievement.

The most frequently used intelligence measure is either the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children/Revised or the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, depending on students' ages. In all programs, psychologists administer intelligence evaluations.

No one measure seems to be used consistently for assessing vocational interest or aptitude. Three programs, however, indicate using the Singer Graflex, probably because all or part of their vocational instruction is Singer-based.

Assessments in perception/memory also show wide variation. Only three programs responded as using more than one perception/memory assessment, while three responded as using no assessment method in this area.

The Thematic Apperception Test is used by three programs for personality assessment. Programs using this measure also use additional assessments such as the Rorschach or Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

The needs assessment process in general, appears to lack system-wide coordination in selection/use of assessment measures. In addition, records reviews and interviews with instructional staff suggest a need for increased emphasis on communicating evaluation data to all staff involved with students. In addition to receiving evaluation data, instructional staff may benefit from receiving assistance in using data in a diagnostic/prescriptive model. Improved use of this data will assist greatly in assuring the development of appropriate individual student programs. Table 2 contains a list of commonly used assessment instruments.

Results from evaluation interviews and record reviews suggest that in most cases written individual student education programs, as described and demonstrated by staff, do not actually comprise diagnostically-based individualized instruction programs.

Curricula, of course, must be considered in any review of student program plans. Although most programs do have some form of written curriculum, it usually is not written in sufficient detail as required by FDE (Chapter 5 Curriculum Regulations).

A reasonably large selection of instructional materials and equipment appropriate for use with handicapped learners appears to exist throughout the juvenile correctional education programs. Staff in a number of programs may benefit from in-service programs designed to assist in matching instructional materials with students' learning styles. Because most programs appear to be incorporating microcomputers into the curriculum, use of computers with handicapped students may be a relevant in-service topic.

Although interview results suggest that most staff understand and apply individualized instruction techniques, many appear not to understand legal implications for special education. As mentioned above, a need exists for increased staff awareness of diagnostic-prescriptive model. Both of these areas should be considered by educational administration in planning staff development programs.

As indicated below, 11%, or 12 of approximately 105 juvenile corrections education professional staff in the programs included in the spring evaluation, hold Pennsylvania-recognized Special Education certification:

PROGRAM	NUMBER OF STAFF WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION CERTIFICATION
YFC #2	2
YFC #3	0
Cornwells Heights	3
Loysville	4
New Castle	2
Danville	1
Weaversville	0

Consideration should be given to directing necessary resources to assure that each education program has at least one special education professional. In addition to providing students with special education programming, this staff person could serve as a resource consultant to all instructional staff.

Cumulative interview results suggest the need for system-wide review of instructional supervision practices. Although instructional and administrative staff demonstrate an exceptionally positive relationship, evaluation data suggests that little actual instructional-based supervision is occurring. Over half of the programs indicate making formal annual or semi-annual teacher evaluations based on observations. Little evidence exists however, on which to assume that teachers receive feedback and assistance based on observation results. Teachers in several programs reported receiving no observation-based feedback. Other teachers felt they hear from administrators only if they request specific assistance or experience a major problem. While comprehensive administration and supervision are necessary in any educational program, they are critical to special education program success. Attention must be given to developing an instructional supervision model which can be adapted to meet the unique needs of each program.

JUVENILE EDUCATION PROGRAM CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

. Long Range Goal

The ultimate correctional special education goal is to provide appropriate educational programs for handicapped juvenile offenders. To the extent possible, program provision should be within P.L. 94-142 compliance guidelines. To realize these goals, current juvenile system education programs must be examined in detail in relation to major P.L. 94-142 provisions as described above. Factors which will assist as well as

impede special education implementation must be identified. Following this form of needs assessment, short and long term action plans must be developed.

In many ways, special education program implementation should cause only relatively minor disruptions. Correction education programs already have many special education-related components such as small student-teacher ratios and emphasis on individualized instruction. The juvenile court system regularly involves students and parents in due process procedures.

Positive DPW-education staff relationships and the resulting high level of morale evidenced by the evaluation results will provide a strong base for cooperation in planning special education programs. The fact that both DPW and education staff demonstrate genuine concern for the welfare of the total student will aid in integrating special education into existing programs. The intent of special education in corrections education is not to further the isolation of the students.

The due process/procedural safeguards provisions may present the most complicated area of concern. Issues such as the role of natural and/or surrogate parents and student eligibility for correctional special education must be addressed.

Related services required to be available to assist students in making effective use of special education programming is a second concern. Low incidence needs for services such as physical therapy and speech, vision or audiology services will preclude employing full time professionals in these areas. Consideration probably will have to be given to expanded interagency networking resulting in part-time or consultant contracts with existing community social services, medical, local/higher education or mental health agencies.

The nature of the juvenile correctional system will present difficulties in complying with the P.L. 94-142 requirement of having an IEP in place before a handicapped student participates in an educational placement. Another related concern will be LRE and placement alternative considerations. The nature of the correctional/treatment setting is restrictive. Integration in "regular" programs with nonhandicapped peers will be important.

Policy Development

PDE/Correction Education Division must develop systematic policies and procedures for providing special education programs and services in juvenile programs. Although most P.L. 94-142 compliance provisions are directed toward public school programs, provisions must be reviewed and considered in relation to the correctional environment. PDE Correction Education Division and Bureau of Special Education should collaborate in this endeavor.

Policies for special education must be developed which are within established treatment models of DPW-operated programs. Interagency cooperation (PDE/DPW) resulting in interagency agreements is important in this process.

Concern by both DPW and educational staff for the welfare of the total student, a strength evident throughout the interview process, can be considered a facilitative factor for any interagency discussion and plan.

A manual or handbook should be developed which clarifies special education policies and procedures. This handbook would address direct, support and administrative areas. A survey of manuals and policies from other states will be an appropriate first step.

. Student Needs Assessment

Consideration must be given to developing a systematic, comprehensive, multidimensional diagnostic model for juvenile correctional education programs. A structure must be developed which clarifies:

- Timelines for initial assessment
- Methods for screening
- Methods for diagnostic evaluations
- Documentation requirements
- Interagency responsibilities

Although gross screening and tentative identification data is usually collected routinely, it is not compiled, analyzed or communicated for placement/program use.

Screening methods must be selected which recognize the need for economy of staff time, as well as validity of results. A full-range in depth diagnostic battery should be identified following a detailed review of instruments/ methods. A range of acceptable alternatives could be developed.

Documentation of student achievement appears to be a system-wide problem. Students' previous school records are often incomplete or unavailable. A procedure could be used in which program staff make consistent, documented efforts to request these records. Records maintained by DPW and educational staff tend to be lacking in comprehensiveness. Provisions/procedures are needed to document existing multidisciplinary review of evaluation and to monitor student progress. Such documentation may reduce the number of situations where students receive redundant assessment.

Interagency coordination may consider methods to encourage the juvenile justice system to recognize the special program needs of handicapped learners. Although educational needs cannot necessarily be considered before legal issues, some emphasis should be able to be given adolescent educational needs. Consideration should be given to the type of correctional setting placement, length of stay in the institution, and educational program needs.

An interagency committee could be used to assess existing student needs assessment practices and to develop plans for a more comprehensive model. Members of this committee may include representatives from state and local education and welfare agencies.

. Staff Development

A comprehensive staff development/in-service plan is needed in the area of correctional special education. Programs should be provided for DPW and education program staff - administrative, support and instructional.

Although a needs assessment survey should be conducted to determine additional specific needs, evaluation results suggest the need for at least the following major areas as identified in Guidelines for Preparation of Teachers in Compliance With U.S. Public Law 94-142 Requiring the Education of Students With Handicaps in the Least Restrictive Environment (PDE, 1980). This document specifies that all Pennsylvania teachers should be provided with opportunities in order to be able to demonstrate an acceptable level of achievement in the following 10 competencies:

. Understand the legal basis for educating students with handicaps in the least restrictive environment.

. Understand the implications which handicapping conditions have for the learning process.

. Recognize students who may be in need of special education.

. Make use of appropriate resource and support services.

. Confer with and report to parents on educational programs for students with handicaps.

. Facilitate the social acceptance of persons with handicaps by encouraging positive interpersonal relationships.

. Use individual, group and classroom management techniques for effective accommodation of students with handicaps.

. Assess the educational needs of student with handicaps.

. Modify instructional strategies to provide for the individual needs of students with handicaps.

. Evaluate classroom progress of students with handicaps.

. Curriculum

Although most programs indicate having some form of written curriculum, it usually is not in the Chapter 5 - required format.[7] The four components which should be in a written curriculum/planned course are:

. A written statement of objectives to be achieved by students.

. Content and instructional time needed to reach learning objectives typically consisting of 120 clock hours of instruction, or a fraction thereof. Fractional planned courses when offered should be in blocks of no less than 30 clock hours.

. Expected levels of achievement.

. Procedures for evaluation.

Regular education planned courses can then be used for special education programs by adopting or adapting them. Only rarely will special education planned courses have to be developed. Available planned courses can be used as resources from which to draw information in developing individual student programs.

Because many students will return to public school settings, creative approaches must be developed to adhere to regulations originally designed for the public school system.

Education programs should continue to place emphasis on instructional and administration applications of high technology. Handicapped learners can make effective use of microcomputer-based instruction.

Approaches such as peer tutoring, precision teaching and computer assisted instruction as described in Technical Assistance on Alternative Practices[8] should be explored. The instructional model described by Crawford (ACLD, 1982) should be reviewed in relation to potential use in correctional special education programming.

Effective schools research synthesized by the PDE Commissioner's Task Force for Instruction (1982) should be reviewed in any correctional special education program or curriculum development effort. The basic elements of this synthesis reveal that effective schools have:

. Identified, accepted school mission
. Strong instructional leadership
. Staff involved in professional growth activities
. High expectations for students to learn

[7] The Planned Course Guidelines, Special Education Edition. September 1982, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

[8] Technical Assistance on Alternative Practices Related to the Problem of the Over-representation of Black and Minority Students in Classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded, Cantalician Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, NY and U.S. Dept. of Education.

- Positive learning environments
- Consistent, frequent monitoring of student progress
- Cooperative communication and acceptance of roles among staff, students and community
- School time used for planning, instruction and learning.

. SpecialNET

Use of SpecialNET, the nationwide computer-based information and communication network, should be explored in relation to correctional special education. This network provides: electronic mail services, electronic bulletin boards with up-to-the-minute information on key special education related topics, and electronic data collection and information management systems. Specific information is providded concerning:

- Special education information on a variety of topics ranging from litigation through policy and promising practices.

- Nationwide network of educators, rescurce organizations, advocacy groups, parents and others.

- Information to improve professional skills and practices.

A Correctional Special Education Bulletin Board, sponsored by C-SET (Correctional/Special Education Training Project) is planned to begin operation in July 1984.

. Resources

In addition to SpecialNET, Correction educators must become aware of and explore the use of existing special education resources. One such resource is the Pennsylvania Special Education Resource System. Regional Resource Centers located in Eastern, Central and Western Pennsylvania are designed to provide no-cost technical assistance and materials on loan to teachers working with handicapped students. Correction educators should also consider membership and participation in professional organizations such as the Correction Education Association.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The interviewing techniques and the evaluation procedures used during the on-site visits to the schools worked well in terms of collecting a vast amount of data. These procedures varied according to the individual style of the interviewer and the unique characteristics of the institution visited. For example, not all of the good things that we knew about institutions came forth. On the other hand, many institutional weaknesses that we knew existed were not clearly evident in the report by the evaluators. In addition, there were some discrepancies between the findings of the evaluators and the schools' self perception and our regular monitoring review process. Of course, we wanted different opinions and this is why we chose outside evaluators to come into the schools and give us their honest opinion based on their careful observations. Schools may not always agree with the findings; however, they must recognize that others outside the establishment may have different points of view. Schools finding themselves at variance with the evaluator's report should accept the challenge as to why others may arrive at different conclusions based on time tested interviewing techniques and clinical observations. One thing that is very clear after reviewing all of the evaluator documents is that there was a great deal of favorable and positive information about schools, staff and students in each institution.

One very consistent finding in all of our institutions is the high morale of staff and students. When one considers the environment and circumstances under which everyone must operate, it is indeed encouraging that the spirit and dedication operates on such a high level. We attribute this to an experienced and skillful cadre of professionals who are able to deal with all forms of difficulty and frustration.

The needs assessment information collected by the schools was generally good. In most cases the data collected was needed in order to make a proper educational placement. If the schools are at fault, it might be that too much data is collected that cannot be used for instructional purposes and that teachers do not access the data for educational planning. The student interviews that were conducted yielded a great deal of candid and open responses to questions concerning both the program and the staff. In the main, these student responses about the educational program and the teaching staff were excellent. Students exhibited a good grasp of the educational objectives and the purposes of their role in the program. Students were consistently positive about the use of materials, equipment and the quality of instruction.

The curriculum was well defined as demonstrated through the PEP process; however, schools still need assistance in writing planned educational programs according to the Chapter 5 format. Staff evaluation procedures as a whole were good. Evaluations usually take the form of both informal and formal contacts with their supervisors. Several teachers felt that they could benefit by constructive feedback following such classroom visits.

Recommendations

One of the most basic activities relating to the well being of the student in a juvenile institution is a well-planned educational program. Careful educational programming for individual clients or small groups with similar needs is crucial to keeping rates of recidivism at low levels.

Based on a review of the evaluation reports, informal meetings following the evaluations with school administrators and conferences with the correction education staff lead to the following recommendations:

1. Schools and institutions should pay careful attention to changes in educational rules and regulations as they affect individual program components. The new Chapter 5 Regulations with revised curriculum requirements, including the need for written planned programs, is an example of such an important change. Schools should develop workshops to inform staff in order to ensure that these regulations are being carried out.

2. Even though the schools are moving forward in meeting the needs of technological education, all needs are still not being met. Schools should examine newly developed courseware and software packages to better meet individual program objectives and to keep up-to-date with developments in the microcomputer field.

3. Schools should examine closely the relationship between (1) the written curriculum, (2) what is taught, and (3) how teaching objectives are tested. Discrepancies have been noted in almost every institution among these three points. It is further suggested that during the teacher/administrator conferences, the curriculum be observed as well as the teaching practices. Also, it is suggested that tests used in diagnostic/perscriptive procedures be clearly examined to determine educational relevance. Many instruments are old and traditional. Perhaps more recent instruments might be utilized.

4. Up-to-date equipment and materials should be part of every school administrator's main file system. Many institutions are not aware of the equipment they have, nor of the condition of such equipment. These are some of the tools available to help meet educational objectives. With the rapid growth in technology, it is important to know what is available.

5. Many institutions take great pride in being able to individualize instruction in order to meet the finite needs of their clients. They are to be commended for this effort and are encouraged to continue; however, recent teaching research indicates that small group instruction under certain conditions might be just as effective. We would hope that, where possible, the school would look into different staffing patterns and utilize these techniques when possible.

6. As a final recommendation, we are suggesting that schools plan a program of self evaluation utilizing internal staff. The progress of self evaluation should be on a continuous basis and should be reviewed at least once a year. Further, schools need to become more involved in the planning of future external evaluations such as the one just concluded. They should also consider the use of peer evaluations projects such as those used by I.U. #15 and I.U. #11 as another option. Correction education staff would be quite willing to assist with the technical aspects of this activity and the results might be very useful. Future budgets prepared by schools should allow for these costs and be considered as part of a regular in-service education project. The PDE has a priority "supervision" and will be a major topic of discussion at Executive Academies scheduled for the 84-85 year. Staff members should be made aware of these sessions and should try to schedule these when possible.

All of these recommendations should be considered along with those mentioned in the special education section of this document. The Correction Education Division is aware of some of the difficulties institutions may have in implementing recommendations. Our hope is that they be taken seriously and that careful, deliberate steps be taken that: (1) involve the health and safety of your clients, (2) incorporate mandates, regulations and laws, and (3) bring into focus specific, institutional priorities.

APPENDICES

ITEM 1

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SUBJECT: Approval of Alternative Education Programs for YDC's, YFC's and Juvenile Security Units

TO: Directors of Education for YDC's, YFC's and Juvenile Security Units

FROM: Ronald H. Lewis
Commissioner for Basic Education

In order for the Department of Education to grant approval of educational programs conducted only in Youth Development Centers (YDC's), Youth Forestry Camps (YFC's) and Juvenile Security Units (JSU's), the directors of these programs must seek approval under Chapter 5, "Curriuclum Regulations," Title 22 Education, Pennsylvania Code (Alternative Schools, Experimental Educational Programs).

Alternative Educational Programs. Under the supervision of the Department of Education, all schools or educational programs established and operated at YDC's or YFC's and Juvenile Security Units established by the Department of Public Welfare for adjudicated youth of compulsory school attendance age must submit annually (January 1) a plan describing their proposed educational program for the subsequent year. The Planned Educational Program (PEP) shall be the format used for the program description.

Use following information when developing your PEP.

1. Experimental Educational Programs. The "Common Core General Education Development Studies" is an approved experimental program tailored to the needs, goals and plans of the individual students. The "Common Core" shall include studies in the areas of basic study skills and basic skills through the eighth grade level of instruction (language arts, arithmetic skills, citizenship education, developmental/corrective reading, introductory science, personal hygiene and sanitation, organized games and recreation).

2. Supplementary Courses. Courses which parallel secondary-level course offerings may supplement the "Common Core" experimental program when such courses are feasible and desirable and meet the special needs of individual students. Such courses, when offered, shall be taught by persons properly certificated for such courses; this includes all diagnostic/ remedial reading activity.

In institutions where this practice is not feasible due to limited residents and teaching staff, exceptions to proper certification may be granted if specified in the Planned Educational Program and approved by the Department of Education as part of the annual alternative educational program approval. The PEP shall set forth the facts supporting the need for an exception to proper certification. The students and teachers involved, the courses to be taught, and the areas of certification affected must be specified. If a request for an exception to proper certification is submitted, the administrator of the alternative educational program shall also annually submit a signed statement from each teacher involved in the alternative educational program. That statement must document the teacher's voluntary acceptance of an assignment to supplementary course(s) outside his/her area(s) of certification.

3. Certification(s) Approved for CCGED Experimental Program of YDC's, YFC's, Juvenile Security Units.

   A. Social Restoration

   B. Elementary Education

   C. Mentally/Physically Handicapped (or Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, Emotionally Disturbed)

PEPs are to be submitted to the Bureau of Curriculum Services, Division of Correction Education. When approved by the bureau and the Commissioner for Basic Education, a signed copy will be returned for implementation.

Additional clarification may be received from:

David Campbell, Director
Bureau of Curriculum Services
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, PA 17126
Telephone: (717) 787-8913

ITEM 2

Evaluators In-Service

February 15, 1984
8th Floor, 333 Market Street
Harrisburg

AGENDA

9:30 - 10:00 a.m.	COFFEE
10:00 - 10:30 a.m.	INTRODUCTION - William Mader Reimbursement Procedure William Mader Allena Bennett Donald Bender Richard Brickley
10:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Schedule Information Dates, Maps, Reservations Jeff Douville
11:00 - 12:00 Noon	Awareness/Background Structure Education Program Staff, Students, P.E.P.S. etc. Donald Bender
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	LUNCH
1:30 - 2:30 p.m.	Instruments Model, Scope, Interview, Questionnaires Observation and Records Procedures Lynda Cook
2:30 - 3:30 p.m.	Conclusions and Requirements Summary to PDE, Format, Chairmans Report, Results, Observations, Raw Data John Peifer

ITEM 3

Evaluators In-Service

March 1, 1984
Intermediate Unit #3
Pittsburgh

AGENDA

9:30 - 10:00 a.m.	COFFEE
10:00 - 10:30 a.m.	INTRODUCTION - William Mader Reimbursement Procedure Donald Bender
10:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Schedule Information Dates, Maps, Reservations Jeff Douville
11:00 - 12:00 Noon	Awareness/Background Structure Education Program Staff, Students, P.E.P.S. etc. Donald Bender
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	LUNCH
1:30 - 2:30 p.m.	Instruments Model, Scope, Interview, Questionnaires Observation and Records Procedures Lynda Cook
2:30 - 3:30 p.m.	Conclusions and Requirements Summary to PDE, Format, Chairmans Report, Results, Observations, Raw Data John Peifer

ITEM 4

JUVENILE EAST

Institution	Evaluators	Dates
Cornwells Heights	Waln Brown Richard Creasey	April 3-5, 1984
Weaversville	Waln Brown	April 10-11, 1984
Youth Forestry Camp #2	Waln Brown Lin Czap William Oakley	March 22-23, 1984
Loysville Y.D.C.	Waln Brown J.C. Rutt Richard Creasey	March 26-18, 1984
Danville Y.D.C.	Waln Brown Jeffrey Douville	April 12-13, 1984

ITEM 4b

JUVENILE WEST

Institution	Evaluators	Dates
New Castle	Ken Calkin Gretchen McFarland Jerry Frisk	April 10-12, 1984
Youth Forestry Camp #3	Ken Calkin Don Kleas	March 28-29, 1984

ITEM 5

INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

. Program Review - Not Teacher Evaluation

. Model

- Administration
- Student Needs Assessment
- Program/Curriculum

. Scope

. Previsitation Components

. Onsite Components

- Form B2 - Student Record Review
- Form E1 - Administrative Staff Interview
- Form E2 - Needs Assessment Staff Interview
- Form E3 - Instructional Staff Interview
- Form E4 - Student Interview

. Interview Numbers and Schedules

ITEM 6

INTERVIEWER EVALUATION PACKET

FOR CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Correction Education Division
Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction
William Mader, Chief
Correction Education Division

CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.	Correction Education Program Evaluation Model (Form A1)	60
2.	Correction Education Program Evaluation Scope (Form A2)	61
3.	Needs Assessment Survey Form (Form B1)	63
4.	Achievement and Ability Form - Juvenile (Form C1)	64
5.	Achievement and Ability Form - Adult (Form C2)	65
6.	Staff Survey Form (Form D1)	66
7.	Interview Forms for Administrative Staff (Form E1)	67
8.	Interview Form for Needs Assessment Staff (Form E2)	69
9.	Interview Form for Instructional Staff (Form E3)	71
10.	Interview Form for Students (Form E4)	74
11.	Evaluator's Institutional Report (Form E5)	75

FORM A1
CORRECTIONS EDUCATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION MODEL

The model for evaluating juvenile and adult corrections education programs is designed to examine three major areas to determine if students' cognitive and program needs are being addressed. These areas include:

- Administration
- Student Needs Assessment
- Program/Curriculum Development and Delivery

Data gathered from reviews of documents such as PEP and student records, survey forms, observations and interviews with persons representing the following categories will be used to determine appropriateness of current programming:

- Administrative staff
- Diagnostic/Needs Assessment staff
- Instructional staff
- Students

At the same time data is gathered to determine appropriateness of educational programming for all students, information having specific relevance to special education programming will be collected. This information will include:

- Identification of students with special educational or programming needs
- Development of appropriate programs to meet identified needs
- Delivery of appropriate programs
- Monitoring of student progress
- Staff knowledge of special education related laws, policies and regulations
- Staff knowledge of special education related instructional strategies and/or methods

FORM A2
CORRECTIONS EDUCATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION SCOPE

I. Administration

A. Is staffing qualitatively and quantitatively adequate to meet the educational programming needs of all students?

1. Certification (Source: PEP, D1, observations)
2. Staff development needs identification and programming (Source: PEP, D1, E1, E2, E3)
3. Staff supervision/evaluation process (Source: D1, E1, E2, E3, observations)
4. Staff/student ratio (Source: D1, E3, observations)

B. Does the current administrative structure provide effective communication of PDE goals to the instructional level?

1. PEP process involvement of staff in development, implementation and revision (Source: PEP, observations)
2. State/Federal laws and regulations as applicable (Source: PEP, observations)
3. Policies (Source: PEP, observations)

II. Needs Assessment

A. Is there evidence of a comprehensive assessment program? (Source: PEP, B1, C1, C2, E2)

B. Is the needs assessment program adequate to identify student needs? (Source: PEP, B1, C1, C2, D1, E2, E3, E4 and student records review)

III. Program/Curriculum Development and Implementation

A. Is there evidence that student needs assessments results are being used in program and curriculum development? (Source: PEP, student records review, E3 and observations)

B. Do current and/or planned programs address documented student needs? (Source: PEP, student records review, E3, E4 and observations)

C. Are staff able to provide the rationale for programming models? (Source: PEP, E1, E2, E3)

D. Are staff development activities related to program needs? (Source: PEP, D1, E1, E2, E3 and observations)

E. What is the curriculum process?

1. What is the curriculum format? (Source: PEP, E3, observations and curriculum review)
2. What provisions exist for curriculum management and evaluation, ex., ongoing system for revisions? (Source: PEP, E3, observations)
3. Does staff have input for curriculum development? (Source: E1, E3, observations)

F. Materials/equipment used are appropriate. (Source: E3, E4, records review and observations)

IV. What evidence exists to indicate that special needs are or are not being addressed? (Source: PEP, observations, records review, Forms B1 through E5)

A. Needs assessment process identifies special needs learners.

B. Programs are developed/implemented in relation to student needs.

C. Records indicating monitoring of student progress.

D. Staff knowledge of special education related laws, policies, regulations.

E. Staff knowledge and use of special education related instructional strategies/methods.

FORM B1
NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY FORM

INSTITUTION _____

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by Correction Education staff and returned to PDE Correction Education Division by: _____
Please supply the following information about your program's student needs assessment process?

A. Instruments or methods used
B. Person who administers each instrument or method
C. Responses to questions following chart

	INSTRUMENTS/ METHODS	POSITION OF PERSON WHO ADMINISTER
SKILL AREAS (ACHIEVEMENT)		
GENERAL INTELLIGENCE		
VOCATIONAL INTEREST PATTERNS		
PERCEPTION AND MEMORY		
PERSONALITY		
OTHER		

1. What are the qualifications/training of staff who administer needs assessment instruments/methods?

2. What are the qualifications/training of staff who interpret resulting data?

3. Who selects instruments/methods? Using what criteria?

FORM C1
ACHIEVEMENT AND ABILITY LEVELS
JUVENILE PROGRAM

INSTITUTION _____ TOTAL NO. OF STUDENTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM: _____

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by Corrections Education Staff and returned to PDE Correction Education Division by: _____ Chart the number of students for each achievement and ability level. Use intake data for 1982-83 students.

READING AND MATH LEVELS

Under 17 Years of Age at Date of Admission

_____ number of students in this age range

I.Q.	0-2.9		3.0-5.9		6.0-8.9		9.0-11.9		12.0>	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
<69										
69-84										
85-100										
101-116										
117-132										
133-148										
>148										

READING AND MATH LEVELS

17 Years of Age and Over at Date of Admission

_____ number of students in this age range

I.Q.	0-2.9		3.0-5.9		6.0-8.9		9.0-11.9		12.0>	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
<69										
69-84										
85-100										
101-116										
117-132										
133-148										
>148										

Adapted from: A Model for the Evaluation of Correctional Education Programs, Lehigh University, 1977

FORM C2
ACHIEVEMENT AND ABILITY LEVELS
ADULT PROGRAM

INSTITUTION _____ TOTAL NO. OF STUDENTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM: _____

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by Corrections Education Staff and returned to PDE Correction Education Division by: _____ Chart the number of students for each achievement and ability level. Use intake data for 1982-83 students.

READING AND MATH LEVELS

~~Under 21 Years of Age at Date of Admission~~

_____ number of students in this age range

I.Q.	0-2.9		3.0-5.9		6.0-8.9		9.0-11.9		12.0>	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
<69										
69-84										
85-100										
101-116										
117-132										
133-148										
>148										

READING AND MATH LEVELS

21 Years of Age and Over at Date of Admission

_____ number of students in this age range

I.Q.	0-2.9		3.0-5.9		6.0-8.9		9.0-11.9		12.0>	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
<69										
69-84										
85-100										
101-116										
117-132										
133-148										
>148										

Adapted from: A Model for the Evaluation of Correctional Education Programs, Lehigh University, 1977

FORM D1
STAFF SURVEY FORM

INSTITUTION _____

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by Corrections Education staff and returned to PDE Correction Education Division by: _____
Please supply requested information for each of the following items:

1. Number of education program staff:

_____ Instructional
_____ Guidance/Psychological
_____ Administrative
_____ Clerical
_____ Aids
_____ Other
_____ Total number of program staff

2. Number of staff holding certification in each of the following areas. (List dual certification under each area)

_____ Elementary Education
_____ Secondary Education
_____ Vocational Education
_____ Guidance
Psychology
_____ Educational
_____ Clinical
_____ Special Education
_____ Speech and Language
_____ Social Restoration
_____ Reading Specialist
Education Administration
_____ Principal
_____ Supervisor
_____ Other (Specify)
_____ Staff not certified
_____ Staff working toward certification
_____
_____
_____

3. How do you evaluate your staff?

4. Explain your perception of staff qualifications and experiences in relation to population needs.

5. How many students does each teacher work with at one time?

FORM E1
INTERVIEW FORM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by the Interviewer. Forms B1, C1, C2, D1 and PEP should be reviewed before interview is conducted.

INSTITUTION _____
POSITION TITLE _____
CERTIFICATION(S) _____
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE _____
_____
_____

1. How do you characterize your major responsibilities?

_____ Strictly administrative
_____ Supervisory
_____ Program development
_____ Program evaluation
_____ Student needs assessment
_____ Instructional
_____ Guidance/Counseling
_____ Disciplinary
_____ Other

Comments:

2. Explain if and how well you feel the education program effectively meets student needs.

(Interviewer - guide discussion for this item from information gathered in your review of the PEP.)

. How is student eligibility for specific programs determined? (Legal and/or policy)

. Comments:

3. What, if any, institutional/operational factors influence educational programming?

E1-2

4. How is teaching staff involved in program development?

5. Describe the staff evaluation process. (Interviewer - Use information from Staff Survey as guide for this item)

   . Evaluation of teaching staff

   . Evaluation of other staff

Comments:

6. Describe the adequacy of the educational staff in relation to capability to meet educational needs of your student population.

   . Quantitatively

   . Qualitively

FORM E2
INTERVIEW FORM FOR NEEDS ASSESSMENT STAFF

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by the Interviewer. Forms B1, C1, C2, D1 and PEP should be reviewed before interview is conducted.

INSTITUTION _____
POSITION TITLE _____
CERTIFICATION(S) _____
EXPERIENCE _____
_____
_____

1. What information is included in the student needs assessment process?

_____ Developmental history
_____ Current Life information
_____ Academic/Achievement levels
_____ Learning styles
_____ Observations
_____ Previous school records
_____ Student expressed (self) needs
_____ Student interview information
_____ Other (Be specific)

2. What are purposes of the needs assessment process?

_____ Screening
_____ Classification/placement
_____ Instruction/Program planning
_____ Student evaluation
_____ Other (Be specific)

3. When are students scheduled for needs assessments?

_____ 1st, 2nd week
_____ 3rd week
_____ 4th week
_____ Later

Explain rationale for this schedule.

4. What is done with needs assessment data?

. How is data summarized?
. Are lists of student strengths/needs developed?
. How is data available to instructional staff?
. How is data used by instructional staff?
. Are individual student prescriptions developed? Explain.
. Are individual education program plans developed (IEPs)? Explain.
. Comments:

5. Describe any teaming process involving education staff:

6. How is resulting need assessment data explained to students?

   . Who meets with students?
   . What information is shared?
   . When does meeting take place?
   . Not applicable

7. How are you evaluated? By whom?

8. How do you characterize your major responsibilities?

   _____ Administrative
   _____ Supervisory
   _____ Program development
   _____ Needs assessment (student evaluation)
   _____ Instructional
   _____ Counseling
   _____ Disciplinary
   _____ Program evaluation
   _____ Other

   Comments:

9. Describe the availability and quality of staff development:

   . How are staff development programs selected?

   . In terms of student needs, what specific staff development programs would you like to see offered?

   . Describe any staff development programs in which you have been involved since September 1982?

   Comments:

10. Of these programs (those listed in #9) which have been:

   . Most valuable?

   . Least valuable?

   Comments:

FORM E3
INTERVIEW FORM FOR INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by the Interviewer. Forms B1, C1, C2, D1 and PEP should be reviewed before interview is conducted.

INSTITUTION _____
POSITION TITLE _____
CERTIFICATION(S) _____
EXPERIENCE _____
_____
_____

1. How are you involved in the students needs assessment process?

   . Administration of tests
   . Teaming process (to identify student needs and communicate progress)

   Comments:

2. Is student needs assessment data available to you?

   . How is it available?
   . Of what use is it to you?
   . In what form/format is this information available?

   Comments:

3. Describe how you assess individual student progress in your program area.

   . Standardized methods
   . Informal methods
   . Record Keeping
   . Long term/short term goals

   Comments:

4. Explain the role each of the following has in the development of programs and/or curriculum:

   . Analysis of student needs
   . Analysis of job market
   . Program evaluation
   . Staff and/or institutional policies
   . Staff interest/expertise
   . Student interest
   . Availability/adequacy of facilities
   . Availability/adequacy of human/material resources
   . Other and/or Comments:

5. Comment on the variety and relevance of learning materials and methods used in your program in relation to the range of student needs.

   Materials (texts, hardware, software, supplies, etc.)

   Methods (lecture, individualized instruction, tutoring, oral tests, preferential seating, etc.)

6. Do you have written curriculum for your program area? (Interviewer - request to review)

   . Is the written material in planned course format?

   . Objectives
   . Content
   . Levels of Achievement
   . Evaluation

   . If not planned course format, what is the format?

   Comments:

7. Do you develop written lesson plans?

   . Group or individual?
   . Daily, weekly, monthly, etc.?
   . Content?

   Comments:

8. Describe the process by which you are evaluated?

   . Who evaluates?
   . How often?
   . What method?
   . How do you evaluate your own effectiveness?
   . What process is here for you to make use of evaluation feedback for improving your effectiveness?
   . Other?

9. Describe supervision availability and quality?

   . What factors must strongly affect staff morale (in both positive and negative ways)?
   . Describe processes for communications of needs and/or concerns?

10. How is the total education program evaluated?

E3-3

11. Describe the availability and quality of staff development:

    . How are staff development programs selected?

    . In terms of student needs, what specific staff development programs would you like to see offered?

    . Describe any staff development programs in which you have been involved since September 1982?

12. Of these staff development programs (those listed in #11), which have been:

    . Most valuable:

    . Least valuable:

FORM E4
STUDENT INTERVIEW FORM

DIRECTIONS: This form is to be completed by the Interviewer. Forms B1, C1, C2, D1 and PEP should be reviewed before interview is conducted.

INSTITUTION _____
AGE _____
TIME IN PROGRAM _____

1. What do you feel you need most from school?

2. What kinds of tests did you take when you arrived?

3. What classes are you in?

   . In which ones are you doing well?

   . In which ones are you doing poorly?

4. Do you feel your classes are helping you get what you have said you need?

5. Rate the materials used in your classes:

   Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Good

6. Describe three characteristics of your best teacher.

7. Describe three characteristics of your poorest teacher

8. What do you like most here?

9. What do you like least here?

10. Has this school helped you in any ways different from the public school?

11. What is your overall impression of the teachers? Are they sensitive to your needs?

12. Rate the entire educational program on a scale of 1 to 5.

    Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Good

    Explain, if you wish.

FORM E5
EVALUATOR'S INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FORM

INSTITUTION _____

EVALUATION TEAM Chr. _____ _____ _____

I. Administration

Staff Concerns:

Programmatic Concerns:

II. Needs Assessment

III. Program/Curriculum Development and Implementation

. Relationship to Needs Assessment

. Processes

. Specific educational needs